arXiv:1604.00456v1 [math.MG] 2 Apr 2016

A NOTE ON THE AFFINE-INVARIANT PLANK PROBLEM

GREGORY R. CHAMBERS

ABSTRACT. Suppose that C is a bounded convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and that $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are planks which cover C in respective directions $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ and with widths $w_1, \ldots, w_k$. In 1951, Bang conjectured that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{w_i}{w_{v_i}(C)} \geq 1,$$

generalizing a previous conjecture of Tarski. Here, $w_{v_i}(C)$ is the width of C in the direction v_i.

In this note we give a short proof of this conjecture under the assumption that, for every m with $1 \leq m \leq k$, $C \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} P_i$ is a convex set.

A *plank* P is the closed, connected region between two parallel hyperplanes H_1 and H_2 in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The distance between these hyperplanes is called the *width* of P. We define the *direction* of P to be the one-dimensional linear subspace v of $\mathbb{R}^n$ which is perpendicular to H_1 and H_2. In 1930, Tarski [5] proved that if $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are planks with widths $w_1, \ldots, w_k$ which cover a unit ball B in $\mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i \geq 2.$$

He asked if an analogous result was true for every bounded convex subset C of $\mathbb{R}^n$. For every one-dimensional subspace v of $\mathbb{R}^n$, we define the width of C in the direction v, $w_v(C)$, as the width of the smallest plank in the direction v which covers C. In other words, if we choose hyperplanes perpendicular to v, which do not intersect the interior of C, and which are minimally separated, then $w_v(C)$ is the distance between those hyperplanes. Tarski's question can be thus stated: If $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are planks which cover C and have widths $w_1, \ldots, w_k$, then is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i \geq \inf_{v \in G(n,1)} w_v(C)?$$

Here, $G(n, 1)$ is the Grassmannian of one-dimensional linear subspaces in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

This conjecture was resolved in 1951 by Bang in [2]. In the same article, he posed the following well-known affine-invariant generalization of this problem.

Conjecture 1. Suppose that C is a bounded convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and that $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are planks in directions $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ and of widths $w_1, \ldots, w_k$ which cover C. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{w_i}{w_{v_i}(C)} \geq 1.$$

If $w_{v_i}(C) = 0$ for some i, then we define the corresponding ratio as $+\infty$, and so the inequality is trivially true.

There have been many articles published on this conjecture. For a survey of these results, as well as other variations of this problem, see [3]. In this note, we prove Conjecture 1 under an additional assumption:

Theorem 1. *Suppose that C is a bounded convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and that $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are planks which cover C. Furthermore, assume that*

$$C \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} P_i$$

is convex for every m with $1 \leq m \leq k$. Then Conjecture 1 is true for C and $P_1, \ldots, P_k$.

The proof of this theorem follows immediately from repeatedly applying the following proposition. We note that the idea of dilating a convex set about a point on its boundary was also used by Alexander in [1] to prove different results.

Proposition 2. *Suppose that C is a bounded convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and that $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are planks which cover C. Furthermore, suppose that P_m has the property that $C \setminus P_m$ is a convex set for some $1 \leq m \leq k$. If Conjecture 1 is true for $C \setminus P_m$ and $P_1, \ldots, P_{m-1}, P_{m+1}, \ldots, P_k$, then it is true for C and $P_1, \ldots, P_k$.*

Proof. Define $X = C \setminus P_m$. We first show that we may make the following assumptions:

(1) $m = 1$
(2) $w_{v_i}(C) > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.
(3) X is not empty.
(4) $w_{v_i}(X) > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Without loss of generality, we can clearly make the first assumption. If $w_{v_i}(C) = 0$ for some i, then $\frac{w_i}{w_{v_i}(C)} = +\infty > 1$, and so we may make

the second assumption. If X is empty, then $\frac{w_1}{w_{v_1}(C)} \geq 1$, allowing us to make the third assumption. If $w_{v_i}(X) = 0$ for some i, then since X contains a point which is not in P_1, since P_1 is closed, and since C is convex, $w_{v_i}(C) = 0$, contradicting the second assumption. Hence, we may make the fourth assumption as well.

Suppose X and C satisfy all of the above assumptions. We will prove that, for every $v \in G(n,1)$,

$$(*) \qquad \frac{w_v(X)}{w_v(C)} \geq \frac{w_{v_1}(X)}{w_{v_1}(C)} \geq 1 - \frac{w_1}{w_{v_1}(C)}.$$

The second inequality is immediate, since $w_{v_1}(X) \geq w_{v_1}(C) - w_1$. We prove the first inequality, beginning with the statement of some elementary facts about the widths of convex sets. Here, v is any element of $G(n,1)$, and K_1, K_2, and K are any bounded convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

(1) If K_1 and K_2 are translates of each other, then $w_v(K_1) = w_v(K_2)$.
(2) If $K_1 = cK_2$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $w_v(K_1) = |c| w_v(K_2)$.
(3) If $K_1 \subset K_2$, then $w_v(K_1) \leq w_v(K_2)$.
(4) $w_v(K) = w_v(\overline{K})$

Our proof proceeds by considering two cases based on how $w_{v_1}(X)$ compares to $w_{v_1}(C)$.

Case 1: If $w_{v_1}(X) = w_{v_1}(C)$, then $\overline{X} = \overline{C}$, and so from fact (4) we have that $w_v(X) = w_v(C)$ for all $v \in G(n,1)$. As a result, $\frac{w_v(X)}{w_v(C)} \geq 1 = \frac{w_{v_1}(X)}{w_{v_1}(C)}$.

Case 2: If $w_{v_1}(C) > w_{v_1}(X) > 0$, then one of the supporting hyperplanes of X in the direction v_1 lies in P_1, and the other lies outside of it. Let H_1 be the first hyperplane, and let H_2 be the second; we have that $H_1 \cap P_1 = \emptyset$, and that $H_2 \subset P_1$. Since H_1 and H_2 are supporting hyperplanes of X, and since $H_1 \cap P_1 = \emptyset$, there exists a point $p \in H_1 \cap \partial C$. From fact (1), we may assume that p is the origin. Let P^* be the plank between H_1 and H_2. From the definition of X and the properties of H_1 and H_2,

$$P^* \cap \overline{C} = \overline{X}.$$

In particular, if V is the unit vector perpendicular to H_1 which points into P^*, then $x \in \overline{X}$ if and only if $x \in \overline{C}$ and $0 \leq V \cdot x \leq w_{v_1}(\overline{X}) = w_{v_1}(X)$.

Let $\rho = \frac{w_{v_1}(X)}{w_{v_1}(C)}$, and consider ρC. We claim that $\rho C \subset \overline{X}$. From the above inequality, we need only show that

$$0 \leq V \cdot x \leq w_{v_1}(X)$$

for every $x \in \rho C$, since $\rho C \subset \overline{C}$. For every such x, there is a $y \in C$ such that $x = \rho y$. We have that

$$0 \leq y \cdot V \leq w_{v_1}(C),$$

and so

$$0 = 0\rho \leq x \cdot V \leq \rho w_{v_1}(C) = w_{v_1}(X).$$

Since $\rho C \subset \overline{X}$, by facts (2), (3), and (4), $\rho w_v(C) \leq w_v(X)$ for every $v \in G(n,1)$. We obtain our result by rearranging this inequality. This proof is shown in Figure 1.

Now, suppose that Conjecture 1 holds for X. We then have that

$$\sum_{i=2}^{k} \frac{w_i}{w_{v_i}(X)} \geq 1,$$

and so by multiplying both sides by $\frac{w_{v_1}(X)}{w_{v_1}(C)}$ and by using $(*)$,

$$\sum_{i=2}^{k} \frac{w_i}{w_{v_i}(C)} \geq \frac{w_{v_1}(X)}{w_{v_1}(C)}.$$

Adding the contribution from P_1 to both sides and using $(*)$ again, we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{w_i}{w_{v_i}(C)} \geq 1.$$

□

FIGURE 1. Proof of Proposition 2.



We close this note with a remark concerning covers of convex sets by planks which cannot be ordered as in Theorem 1. We describe a configuration, found by Hunter in [4], of three planks P_1, P_2, and P_3 which cover the equilateral triangle T of side length 1 such that no plank's removal results in a convex set, and such that

$$\frac{w_1}{w_{v_1}(T)} + \frac{w_2}{w_{v_2}(T)} + \frac{w_3}{w_{v_3}(T)} = 1.$$

In particular, this configuration shows that equality cases of Conjecture 1 can occur without satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1. The configuration is as follows. For each vertex v, we add a plank of width $1/3$ whose center line passes through v and bisects the interior angle of T at v.

Acknowledgments The author would like to thank Marianna Csörnyei for useful conversations with regard to this problem. This work was partially supported by an NSERC postdoctoral fellowship.

References

1. Ralph Alexander, *A problem about lines and ovals*, The American Mathematical Monthly **75** (1968), no. 5, 482–487.
2. Thøger Bang, *A solution of the "Plank Problem"*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **2** (1951), no. 6, 990–993.
3. Károly Bezdek, *Geometry — intuitive, discrete, and convex: A tribute to László Fejes Tóth*, ch. Tarski's Plank Problem Revisited, pp. 45–64, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
4. Henry F. Hunter, *Some special cases of bang's inequality*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **117** (1993), 819 – 821.
5. Alfred Tarski, *Further remarks about the degree of equivalence of polygons (in Polish)*, Parametr **2** (1932).

Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
E-mail address: chambers@math.uchicago.edu